



**de Castro, Pablo (2018) Open access to publications : challenges and way forward. In: CESAER Annual Meeting 2018, 2018-10-17 - 2018-10-19, Polytechnic University Bucharest. ,**

This version is available at <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/65818/>

**Strathprints** is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Unless otherwise explicitly stated on the manuscript, Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Please check the manuscript for details of any other licences that may have been applied. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or private study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the Strathprints administrator: [strathprints@strath.ac.uk](mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk)

# OPEN ACCESS TO PUBLICATIONS: CHALLENGES AND WAY FORWARD

WORKSHOP OPEN SCIENCE  
BUCHAREST, 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018

Pablo DE CASTRO (University of Strathclyde)

# OVERVIEW

## PART I

THE OPEN ACCESS WG UNDER THE CESAER TFOS UMBRELLA

## PART II

THE CURRENT OPEN ACCESS LANDSCAPE

## PART III

PLAN S AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

## PART IV

OPEN ACCESS WG PLANS

# PART I

## THE OPEN ACCESS WG

- Coordinated by Uni Strathclyde (Pablo de Castro) & TIB Hannover (Marco Tullney)
- Representatives from: the Netherlands (TU Delft), Germany (TIB Hannover, RWTH Aachen), Austria (TU Wien), Finland (Aalto Uni), Poland (Gdansk Uni Technology), Czech Republic (Czech Technical Uni Prague), Italy (Politecnico di Milano), Spain (Polytechnic Uni Catalonia, Polytechnic Uni Valencia), Switzerland (ETHZ), Sweden (Lund Uni), the UK (Strathclyde Uni) and Israel (Technion Haifa)
- Emphasis on the disciplinary approach to OA implementation, looking into differences by countries and institutions
- Monthly online calls, plus face-to-face meetings at CESAER Annual Conference
- Some of the topics we deal with are:

12 countries

# PART I

## THE OPEN ACCESS WG: TOPICS ADDRESSED

### Analysis of level of alignment from different perspectives

1. Available institutional system infrastructure
  - Mapping repository and CRIS landscape within the group
  - Availability of OJS-supported institutional journals & related best practices
  - Examining OpenAIRE-compatibility
2. Analysis of (rather similar) publishing profiles at an institutional level
  - What are the most popular journals? What's the distribution by publishers? How many fully OA journals in the institutional top-10?
  - Year-on-year evolution
3. Analysis and comparison of national- and institutional-level policies
  - Green OA- vs Gold OA-based models and their implementation

# PART I

## THE OPEN ACCESS WG: TOPICS ADDRESSED

### Joint examination of the publishing landscape

1. Cross-institutional, cross-country discussion on agreements with publishers (or lack thereof)
2. Discussion on potential actions towards institutional researchers involved in journal editorial committees: survey & get together
3. Analysis of the specifics of OA publishing in the Engineering Sciences
  - Lack of fully OA journals in specific fields of Engineering?
  - Plenty of 'irregular journals' that do not issue DOIs or use CC licences but get numerous manuscript submissions

#### Survey for researchers involved in journal editorial committees

**Q1.** How long have you been serving in the editorial committee you're currently a member of?

**Q2.** What are your main motivations for doing this job?

- required/rewarded at my institution
- collaborate in the progress of my discipline
- staying up-to-date in the developments in my area
- steering/influencing the developments in my discipline (e.g. by suggesting the appropriate special

# PART II

## THE CURRENT OPEN ACCESS LANDSCAPE



The Competitiveness Council meeting in Brussels this week.

EU Competitiveness Council

### In dramatic statement, European leaders call for 'immediate' open access to all scientific papers by 2020

By **Martin Enserink** | May. 27, 2016 , 2:30 PM

Science, 27/05/2016

<http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/05/dramatic-statement-european-leaders-call-immediate-open-access-all-scientific-papers>

CESAER



# FRAGMENTATION

Concerning open access to **scientific peer-reviewed publications**, most EU Member States reported a national preference for one of the two types of open access, either the Green (self-archiving) or the Gold (open access publishing) model. Preference for the Green model is found in Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia and Spain. Those expressing a preference for the Gold model are Hungary, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Other Member States support both models equally, such as Germany, France, Croatia, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland and Finland. However, the expressed preferences for one of the two models are not pure models in which only one route is followed. Instead, there is generally a system of predominance of one model with the possibility of using the other model, so a mixture of both routes results.

“Access to and Preservation of Scientific Information in Europe: Report on the implementation of Commission Recommendation C(2012) 4890 final”, [http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/pdf/openaccess/npr\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/pdf/openaccess/npr_report.pdf)

## Gold Open Access

APC-based business model

Offsetting deals

APC-free Open Access publishing

## Green Open Access

Open Access repositories

Overlay services



# GREEN OA & REPOSITORIES

OpenDOAR

Directory of Open Access Repositories

[Home](#) | [Find](#) | [Suggest](#) | [Tools](#) | [FAQ](#) | [About](#) | [Contact Us](#)

## Search or Browse for Repositories

Any Subject Area  Any Content Type  Any Repository Type

Any Country  Any Language  Any Software

Summaries  20  per page. Sort by:  Repository Name

To search the *contents* of the repositories listed in OpenDOAR, please see our [Content Search](#) page.

Results 1 - 20 of 3520.

Page: << Previous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Next >>



Towards a global knowledge commons

[Activities](#)

[Community](#)

[News & Publications](#)

[About](#)

Advocacy & Leadership

Next Generation Repositories

Background and Vision

## Next Generation Repositories

### Next Generation Repositories Recommendations

In November 2017, COAR published the report, [Behaviours and Technical Recommendations of the COAR Next Generation Repositories Working Group](#). The report published a list of 19 technologies and protocols that are recommended to improve the way repositories function.



CESAER

# 'READ AND PUBLISH' AGREEMENTS

The Jisc logo consists of the word "Jisc" in white lowercase letters on an orange square background.

## Principles for Offset Agreements

As open-access (OA) publishing funded by article-processing charges (APCs) becomes more widely accepted, UK academic institutions face an increase in the 'total cost of publication', comprising subscription costs plus APCs and additional administration costs. Most APC payments are made to large 'traditional' commercial publishers who also received considerable subscription income. Jisc Collections is asking publishers to introduce offset systems that will reduce this extra cost to UK higher education.



### Read & Publish institutional agreements

Our Read & Publish scheme lets corresponding authors at eligible institutions publish gold open access in our hybrid journals.



### Open access agreement for UK authors

Springer has a national agreement with UK institutions, negotiated through Jisc. The agreement provides access to more than 2,000 of Springer's subscription journals, as well as allowing all authors from participating institutions to publish open access in subscription journals that offer the Open Choice option.

**THE ISSUE: HYBRID JOURNALS ARE NO GOOD**

**CESAER**

# PART III

## 'PLAN S': A CATALYST FOR CHANGE

### The 10 Principles of Plan S

1. Authors **retain copyright** of their publication with no restrictions. All publications must be published under an **open license**, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution Licence **CC BY**. In all cases, the license applied should fulfil the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration;
2. The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of **robust criteria and requirements for the services** that compliant high quality Open Access journals and Open Access platforms must provide;
3. In case such high quality Open Access journals or platforms do not yet exist, the Funders will, in a coordinated way, **provide incentives to establish and support them when appropriate**; support will also be provided for Open Access infrastructures where necessary;
4. Where applicable, **Open Access publication fees are covered by the Funders or universities**, not by individual researchers; it is acknowledged that all scientists should be able to publish their work Open Access even if their institutions have limited means;
5. When Open Access publication fees are applied, their **funding is standardised and capped** (across Europe);
6. The Funders will ask universities, research organisations, and libraries to **align their policies and strategies, notably to ensure transparency**;
7. The above principles shall apply to all types of scholarly publications, but it is understood that the timeline to achieve Open Access for **monographs and books** may be longer than 1 January 2020;
8. The **importance of open archives and repositories** for hosting research outputs is acknowledged because of their long-term archiving function and their potential for editorial innovation;
9. **The 'hybrid' model of publishing is not compliant with the above principles**;
10. The Funders will **monitor** compliance and **sanction** non-compliance.

# ‘PLAN S’: PRECEDENT

## Main Policy Guidelines

- The FP7 project *should have finished* by the time the funding is requested, but *no longer than two years ago*;
- *A maximum of three publications* will be funded per eligible FP7 project as a means to ensure a fair distribution of the funding across projects;
- Publications eligible for funding *must be peer-reviewed*;
- Funding requests must be submitted *once the publication has been accepted*;
- Publications submitted to hybrid journals will not be funded, but only those accepted at fully Open Access journals;
- *Funding caps* of €2,000 for research articles and €6,000 for monographs apply for this Pilot;
- The final version of the funded output *must be deposited* in an OpenAIRE-compliant Open Access repository.



# RESPONSES TO 'PLAN S'

**eurodoc**

The European Council of Doctoral  
Candidates and Junior Researchers



## Joint Statement on Open Access for Researchers via Plan S

(3) We agree that a funding **cap** should be set on publication fees for Open Access to reduce unnecessary high spending of public funds for access to research. We note that Plan S does not set a specific cap and it is unclear what consequences a cap could have on the scholarly publishing ecosystem.

(4) We agree with **immediate** Open Access and that there should be no embargo periods on publications. We note a lack of explicit reference to the role of 'green' publishing and the relation between green and 'gold' publishing in Plan S. We understand that the green route in Plan S refers to self-archiving a final version of a publication without an embargo period whereby the author retains copyright under an open licence. We believe that such a green route is a viable and sustainable alternative to the fee-based gold route and could play a key role in the shift to immediate Open Access. We encourage RPOs and RFOs not to focus solely on the gold route but to adopt an 'always green optionally gold' publishing policy. We also encourage publishers to offer a green route option for publications as per criteria in Plan S. route is a viable and sustainable alternative to the fee-based gold route and could play a key role in the shift to immediate Open Access. We encourage RPOs and RFOs not to focus solely on the gold route but to adopt an 'always green optionally gold' publishing policy. We also encourage publishers to offer a green route option for publications as per criteria in Plan S.

# RESPONSES TO 'PLAN S'

## COAR's response to Plan S

1. Do not restrict the vehicles for providing open access to 'journals' and 'platforms', but rather develop assessment criteria based on functions, like peer-review and other types of editorial services.
2. Make use of the existing organized and globally connected repository network to advance Open Access and Open Science across the world.
3. Be aware and responsive to the significant concerns in other regions and countries about the widespread adoption of the APC model.

## Unlocking Research

*University of Cambridge Office of Scholarly Communication*

**Relax everyone, Plan S is  
just the beginning of the  
discussion**

© September 12, 2018   📁 Uncategorized   📌 academic freedom, CC-BY, copyright, Plan S, Science  
Europe   📍 Office of Scholarly Communication

# 'PLAN S': A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD



## **The Fair Open Access Principles**

- \* The journal has a transparent ownership structure, and is controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community.
  - \* Authors of articles in the journal retain copyright.
- \* All articles are published open access and an explicit open access licence is used.
- \* Submission and publication is not conditional in any way on the payment of a fee from the author or its employing institution, or on membership of an institution or society.
- \* Any fees paid on behalf of the journal to publishers are low, transparent, and in proportion to the work carried out.



# 'PLAN S': A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD



The TTOA Consortium is an initiative of the **Fair Open Access Alliance** ([www.faiopenaccess.org](http://www.faiopenaccess.org)) and is aligned with

- 'native' open access publishers:

**PLoS, MDPI, Frontiers, Copernicus Publications, Ubiquity Press, OLH**

- traditional subscription-based publishers,

**De Gruyter, Brill**

- and open access publishers that do not charge authors:

**Open Edition**

In addition to publishers, the following organizations are collaborating partners:

**CWTS (Leiden University), CESAER, QOAM, MPDL.**

# ‘PLAN S’: A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD



[The Fair Open Access principles](#) [Who we are](#) [Our mission](#) [News](#) [Membership](#) [Contact us](#)

Search



## The Fair Open Access Alliance (FOAA) on Plan S

The Fair Open Access Alliance (FOAA) on Plan S:

**Press release, September 19th 2018, COASPA – Vienna**

The Fair Open Access Alliance (FOAA) enthusiastically welcomes and endorses the bold proposal of cOAlition S to accelerate the transition to Open Access in Europe.

- A fully transparent publication fee (PF) is key in our approach: participating publishers have agreed to provide a breakdown of the per-article costs of publishing.
- Open peer-review and open data will also be our goal, and the CWTS will be our partner for the implementation of [‘responsible metrics’](#).
- In addition, all publishers we are talking with in the TTOA Consortium have agreed that the publication fee will not exceed €1400 per article on average, a sustainable figure that preserves the future of scholarly publishing.

# PART IV

## CESAER OPEN ACCESS WG PLANS

- Keep advancing along the lines described in Part I
- Collaborate with national-level initiatives such as the Opening project in Germany
- Prepare a report with the findings of the analysis on levels of alignment and compared publishing landscape
- Hold a face-to-face WS in Delft by Spring next year

